

**Pg. 2 -**

**The path to freedom**

**Pg. 3 -**

**A counterfelt conspiracy**



# Colorado Liberty

Published by the Colorado Libertarian Party

Volume 6, Number 6

November-December, 1984



Penn Pfiffner, CLP Campaigns Chairman, gets election results hot off the wire.

## Election analysis

# National LP vote falls to near 1976 levels

by David F. Nolan

almost exactly on a county-by-county basis for a statewide total of about

## Bergland describes LP in Boulder speech

by Ron Bain

BOULDER— The United States Government is a "trillion dollars bankrupt" and should be treated like any other bankrupt institution, its creditors satisfied by the sale of its assets and its investors paid off at a percentage of their dollar investment, 1984 Libertarian Presidential Candidate David Bergland told an audience of approximately 125 persons during a pre-election campaign stop at the CU Event Center.

Advocating a return to the gold standard, abolition of the Federal Reserve System and legal tender laws, and elimination of the Social Security Tax that would include a lump-sum payoff to elderly investors in the Social Security system, Bergland summarized his views on economic and other issues during an hour-long speech and half-hour question-and-answer session on October 9.

"We say that taxation is theft," he said.

Because the government is bankrupt, Bergland explained that the Social Security taxes of those who are currently

want you to have is the liberty to keep the fruits of your own labor," he said.

"We begin from a rather remarkable position," Bergland continued, "that you own yourself."

Libertarians, for example, oppose slavery in any form and consider the draft to be "involuntary servitude," the candidate said.

Ronald Reagan spoke against conscription and registration during his 1980 presidential campaign, but failed to eliminate draft registration during his first term. Instead, the president's administration has prosecuted and sent to jail young men who refused to register for the draft, Bergland pointed out.

Former Vice-President Walter Mondale has in the past advocated a national, universal draft service similar to Israel's, which would obligate every American citizen to a period of military or government service, Bergland said.

The number of people and groups interested in opposing big government and obtaining more freedom, such as tax and draft resisters, is growing, and

by David F. Nolan

Deprived of the Koch family's millions, which bought numerous national TV spots for Ed Clark in 1980, the vote total for David Bergland and Jim Lewis fell by nearly 75% from 1980's level of 920,000 to around 250,000. This is close to 50% higher than our 1976 showing of 172,000, but nonetheless represents a major setback.

Plagued by financial and managerial problems from the start, the Bergland-Lewis campaign never really "took off" in the way that the Clark campaign did four years earlier. Lacking the Koch millions, the hard-pressed campaign achieved ballot status in only 39 states. Campaign materials were produced late and distributed sparsely. Virtually no national advertising was ever placed.

Individual efforts by both Bergland and Lewis were heroic, with each of them making several hundred campaign appearances. Both candidates produced campaign books, and Jim Lewis's *Liberty Reclaimed* is already being hailed by many as the most eloquent introduction to our philosophy yet published... but the lack of funds and poor campaign direction combined to produce what numerous Libertarians have dubbed "the invisible campaign."

The Colorado Bergland-Lewis vote was approximately 11,000 out of 1.2 million votes cast—just under 1% of the total. Comparable figures for 1976 and 1980 were 5,339 (0.5%) and 25,744 (2.2%). Strongest showings this time were in Denver and Arapahoe Counties, where the Bergland-Lewis ticket garnered 6 to 7 votes per precinct, and in mountain counties like Gilpin, Park, Pitkin, Chaffee and Summit. In some outlying areas, the ticket got less than one vote per precinct. Statewide average was 4 votes per precinct, out of 400-500 cast.

#### COLORADO RACES

Other Libertarians fared similarly in Colorado. Craig Green's vote for U.S. Senate paralleled the Bergland-Lewis vote

almost exactly on a county-by-county basis, for a statewide total of about 10,600. Jerry Van Sickle and Randy Fitzgerald pulled over 1% of the vote in their respective Congressional races, while Dwight Filley and Bob Jakelka both fell short of the 1% mark.

Filley's vote total was almost certainly lowered by unfortunate ballot placement; Bergland and Green were both on the same line, and many Libertarian-inclined voters probably assumed that the Congressional candidate on that line was also Libertarian. Not so; in fact, the Secretary of State put the Socialist Workers candidate on "our" line, and Filley on the line below. As a result, the SWP candidate got many votes intended for us!

In lower-level races, Colorado Libertarians fared better. Jim Phelps got about 15% in a two-way race for state legislature, while Geoff Lloyd got over 35% in his RTD race, also a two-way contest.

#### IN OTHER STATES

Bergland-Lewis vote totals were uniformly lower than Clark figures four years ago. Only in a handful of Western states did their total surpass the 1% level, with none except Alaska exceeding 2%.

Races for Governor and U.S. Senator also showed disappointing results. Best showing was in Montana, where Larry Dodge received 3.2% in his race for Governor and Neil Halprin pulled 2.3% for U.S. Senate. Other Senate candidates who topped the 1% mark were Don Billings (1.7%, Idaho), Stephen Davis (1.4%, South Carolina) and Steven Givot (1.3%, Illinois).

Givot received the highest statewide total of any Libertarian candidate for a major office—nearly 60,000 votes out of 4.7 million; this was close to the 75,000 vote margin between victorious Democrat Paul Simon and defeated Republican Charles Percy. Several prominent conservative groups, including NCPAC, had endorsed Givot in hopes of drawing votes away from Percy.

Cont. on pg. 4

Bergland explained that the Social Security taxes of those who are currently working pay the checks of those who are currently receiving retirement benefits. In the very near future, Bergland said, more people will be retired than are working and the Social Security system will collapse.

To avoid this, Bergland advocated a phase-out of Social Security taxes and benefits that would give those 56 or older a lump-sum payment based on a percentage of what they were scheduled to receive, assuming an average life expectancy. Those younger than 56 would receive tax relief they could invest in their retirement, Bergland said. "One of the liberties we Libertarians

and obtaining more freedom, such as tax and draft resisters, is growing, and they are prompting Libertarians to form a "broad coalition of freedom interest groups," Bergland said.

Also included in the coalition could be parents wishing to enroll their children in non-certified, or church-sponsored schools, those desiring to medicate themselves or avail themselves of nonlicensed doctors, those opposed to the laws prohibiting the cultivation, possession or sale of marijuana, gay rights groups, and others, he said.

Freedom-interest groups concerned with primarily one issue, however, will need tolerance for other groups to fit

Cont. on pg. 4

## Supreme Court hears Indian arguments on tribal land

by Eric Stratton

On Monday, November 5, the U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments on a case brought by the Bureau of Land Management in regard to the Western Shoshone Indian tribe's rights to 16,000,000 acres of grazing land in Nevada. The Shoshones have occupied the area for centuries. They were never conquered and the whole government's title claim to these lands is clouded.

Previously, the government offered the

tribe \$26,000,000 for the acreage, plus an additional 6,000,000 acres that have been developed. The Shoshones have refused the payment, saying that they want to keep the land. It is estimated that the grazing rights to the land could produce some \$30,000,000 in revenues to the tribe annually.

Whatever decision the court reaches will have a large impact on the claims of other tribes to so-called public land. Watch for further reports as the story unfolds.

**Colorado Libertarian Party**  
2186 S. Holly, 207B  
Denver, CO 80222

**Non-Profit Organization**  
U.S. Postage Paid  
Denver, CO  
Permit No. 675

**Address Correction  
Requested**

**Return Postage  
Guaranteed**

# Editorials and Comments

## Guest editorial

# Which way the road to freedom?

by Ruth Bennett

The thing that holds the Libertarian Party together is that our Party is based on certain principles; the primary being that we do not believe in the initiation of force to achieve political or social goals. This is what distinguishes us from the older political parties and actually makes us unique in the annals of political history.

We are not a cult of a personality like the Bullmoose Party or the Unity or Citizens Parties. We're not interested in gaining political power. We're not trying to get elected to keep someone else from getting elected. We have the strange goal of *liberty*, of trying to influence the political process in order to eliminate most of what the current political process does. No wonder we often confuse people.

I notice that unthinking adherence to principles is also one of our greatest weaknesses. It's usually a weakness within the Party, but such adherence also hurts us when we're trying to persuade other parties to vote for us.

I've talked to Libertarians in at least 30 states. One of the problems I've heard over and over is that there are too many people who only want to sit around and debate the issues, that too many people only want "pure" libertarians to be able to join the Party, that too many people would rather have a discussion group or

principle versus politics. He said to picture Freedom as a great shining mountain. But there is some good news and some bad news. The bad news is that there are a lot of paths to the top of that mountain. But, he went on, the good news is that there are a lot of paths to the top of that mountain.

There is no one best way of achieving a free society. There are many paths to the top of that mountain. The *Reason* Foundation is doing a wonderful job with *Reason* Magazine with their investigative articles and support of authors. The CATO Foundation and the CATO summer seminars are improving the intellectual climate for Libertarian ideas. The National Taxpayers Union, John Holt's home schooling movement, hard money groups, computer users who are working to decentralize businesses or the Society for Individual Liberty whose program is largely made up of discussion groups and position papers—each of these groups or movements is another way to make our society more free. Each is another path to the top of that mountain.

The Libertarian Party is the path I have chosen to climb that mountain; the Libertarian Party is the vehicle I see doing the most in the shortest amount of time to achieve liberty.

The Libertarian Party is a *political* party. Certainly, it is based on principle. But its major function is to influence elective politics to achieve a free society.



"What do they mean, no mandate?! I even joked about this and they still elected me!"

## Letters

### Democracy and defense

To the Editor:

Since I did not have an opportunity at the time of publication, I feel I must respond to Mike Dunn's letter criticizing my article on a voluntary national defense (Colorado Liberty, July-August, 1984).

Mr. Dunn correctly points out the theoretical differences between a democracy and a constitutional republic.

is to say I don't have much in common with 99% of the students here. One of my major worries, of course, is that before I am old enough to buy liquor for myself, Ronald Reagan will have managed to reduce the Denver Metro Area to a radioactive slag heap. But it was with some alarm that I read Dwight Filley's editorial, "Why We Should Buy a Missile Defense System," in the July/August issue of the Colorado Liberty.

While I realize that the idea of a purely defensive system is quite attractive as

debate the issues, that too many people only want "pure" libertarians to be able to join the Party, that too many people would rather have a discussion group or a supper club than petition or doorbell or run for office or do any of the things that nuts-and-bolts political work is composed of. Too many people view the Libertarian Party as only an intellectual exercise.

Well, to be real honest, most times I'd rather sit around and discuss monetary commodities, or unilateral disarmament, but I realize that this is not likely to raise another nickel for the L.P. or get another state on the ballot or cause one more person to vote for David Bergland or make one more person aware of the Libertarian Party. A discussion group is fun and interesting and I may learn something from it, but it's not likely to take us one step closer to a free society.

At the last National Convention in New York City, one of my favorite speakers was Doug Casey. Many of you may be familiar with his book, "Crisis Investing." He ended his speech with words which I think are applicable to this dilemma of

The Libertarian Party is a *political* party. Certainly, it is based on principle. But its major function is to influence elective politics to achieve a free society. Its primary purpose is not to be debating society or the front group for a lot of potluck parties on adequate defense or decriminalization of drugs.

I am not proposing a wholesale purge from the Party of people who would rather have discussions than do the necessary political work that needs to be done. What I am proposing is that we not put "debaters" in positions of political responsibility. Let them be on platform committees, and on panels at issues in conventions. Let them operate as reasonable checks on our candidates, for we are an ideological party. But when those whose main concerns are ideas and not actions try to fill an "action" oriented position, our goals of achieving liberty through political processes are not met.

One other problem with so many of our "thinkers" rather than "doers" is that they are often so "pure" that they do not want anyone else who is not "pure"

Cont. on pg. 3

defense (Colorado Liberty, July-August, 1984).

Mr. Dunn correctly points out the theoretical differences between a democracy and a constitutional republic, although the difference doesn't really exist any more in practice. Our so-called republic has *become* a democracy, regardless of what some political romanticists would like to think. In fact, such a transition is inevitable. The fallacy of relying on a constitution to protect individual rights is that the constitution becomes interpreted by those in power in a way that allows them to promote their own political goals, regardless of individual rights. Furthermore, even the representative republic which Mr. Dunn seems to favor must, at best, be selected by a democratic process. Surely he doesn't think that when only about 15 to 20 percent of the population vote in favor of a representative (realistic numbers in Colorado), that this constitutes "representation." Only when government's power extends only to those who have explicitly given their consent will such governments begin to approach legitimacy.

With respect to Mr. Dunn's criticism of another statement contained in my article, there was an editing error. A couple of key words were left out of my last sentence, which changed its whole meaning: I did not write that our armed forces do not resemble defense; I said that the \$200 billion pork barrel at the Pentagon (escalating to almost \$300 billion as we speak) does not resemble defense. Indeed, more than half of the military's budget has nothing to do with defense, and from this I conclude that significant reductions can be made in military spending without impairing our truly defensive capabilities.

-Craig Green

## 'Star Wars' won't work

To the Editor:

Greetings! I am a student at CU, and am fairly interested in finding alternative solutions to the almost insurmountable problems facing our country, which

a Missile Defense System," in the July/August issue of the Colorado Liberty.

While I realize that the idea of a purely defensive system is quite attractive as opposed to the certainly risky prospect of nuclear disarmament, the plan has one flaw: it won't work. Let me assure you that we *do not* have the technology to build such a system, regardless of what Ronald Reagan says on the matter.

I will understand completely if you do not take my word for it, but I urge Mr. Filley to read Freeman Dyson's *Weapons and Hope*. This, along with selected reports from the bibliography, pretty conclusively show there is no way we could build such a system with more than a 6-7% chance of stopping a concerted nuclear attack.

Furthermore, the system would raise U.S.-U.S.S.R. tensions, destabilize almost any superpower conflict, and cost an estimated \$500 billion. As a proponent of smaller government, I do not understand how you can support such a project.

Sir, thank you very much for reading this letter. I do not know whether the opinion expressed in the column was yours or the official party line, but either way, I urge you to research this, and think seriously about the implications. I truly believe the "Star Wars Defense" to be an incredibly dangerous idea. Once again, thank you for listening.

-Marcus Elmore

## An activism tip

To the Editor:

I've been a libertarian since 1957. I'm always looking for impacting methods of getting Libertarian principles across to others without having to spout political slogans. Slogans are notoriously ineffective.

On Page 7 of the Colorado Liberty paper I found a very good example of such an impacting activity: the form to provide waiters and waitresses with a gift statement to cover a "tip" as a "gift."

It's perfect. It's of value to each group mentioned, and clearly (personally) understandable to those persons that accept the premise.

Bob Eson, Libertarian



# Colorado Liberty

PUBLISHED BY THE COLORADO LIBERTARIAN PARTY

Volume 6, Number 6

2186 S. Holly, 207B, Denver, CO 80222, 753-6789, published six times a year by the Colorado Libertarian Party. The deadline for material and advertising is the 20th of the month preceding publication. We welcome typewritten articles, letters to the editor, photos and artwork, and will print the best of what we receive. Hint: write concisely.

Opinions expressed in signed articles are those of the author, not necessarily of the Colorado Libertarian Party. Likewise, advertising does not imply endorsement. Advertising rates available upon request.

## Staff

### Contributors

Patrick Lilly

Ron Bain

Chris Mohr

Ruth Bennett

Stormy Mon

David Nolan

Don Bain

### Managing Editor

Carolyn Phelps

### Editorial Staff

Betty Beverly

Bob Hurt

### Computer Services

Rob Gilmore

### Typesetting

Mountaintop Publishing, Inc.

### Graphics and Layout

Ron Bain

Loretta Bain

# Coming: Money worth less than nothing

by Patrick L. Lilly

Free market economists have long known that the Federal Reserve Notes currently circulating in place of legal dollars are non-redeemable tokens without any actual value. But as early as next year, the U.S. Government may introduce the next phase in the devaluation of money: "dollars" which are not only devalued, but are also an actual *liability* to those who hold and spend them, money actually worth less than nothing.

Sources close to powerful Congressional committee members report that the new dollar bills, to replace the current FRN's, have *already been printed*, and only await the start of the requisite government propaganda campaign to foist them off on the public. These "new dollars" have two important characteristics which will adversely affect

the private economy: they will be worth less than the current ones—on the order of half—and they will be magnetically encoded, like credit cards, signaling the beginning of the end of private economic transactions not subject to governmental scrutiny in America. Thus, in addition to being without any real economic value, the new dollars will be worth less than nothing—a danger and a liability to anyone using them, a tool by which government can intrude even further than it does now into private financial affairs.

The "pitch" with which these new government currency units will be introduced reportedly will center on socking it to the U.S. Government's favorite boogey-men—drug dealers, as well as other, unspecified, "criminals." The public is expected to embrace enthusiastically the idea of forcibly depriving "pushers" of the value of their money, and not to notice the adverse effects on virtually everyone of the first explicit devaluation of the U.S. currency since the gold standard was abandoned.

But more important than even the economic impact of the devaluation (we've been subjected to gradual devaluation through inflation of decades, anyway) will be the alarming loss of financial privacy. What the government is planning here is a virtual abolition of "cash" as we have known it—a medium in which private individuals could engage in truly private transactions without having to invite the government in on the deal. Once the magnetically encoded "dollars" have replaced the old ones, it will no longer be possible for anyone to buy or sell anything without the government knowing about it. It will be possible to trace the path of individual bills from hand to hand through society with machines and computers, instead of time-consuming human oversight.

This also means the confiscation—100% taxation—of cash savings, unless the saver goes to a government-regulated

be substituted, one which, unbelievable as it seems at first glance, is even more worthless than those now in use.

This is all a natural, and perhaps inevitable, result of the governmentalization of money. Once the American people allowed the government to transform the basic concept of "money" from one of private transactions involving privately held wealth to one of governmental units of account involved in the carrying out of governmental policy, this became possible. And having become possible, it has come to be viewed as convenient for those in power, and, barring some minor unforeseeable miracle, is about to come to pass.

Private businesses could conceivably soften the blow of this latest government policy shift, delay its full implementation, by adopting a policy of continuing to accept the "old dollars" after the new ones are introduced. To do so, however, they would have to put themselves at some financial risk, for *banks* (regulated by the Federal Government) will *not*

continue to accept the old bills, thus forcing businesses either to convert completely to the new bills, or move part of their business volume explicitly into the underground economy, a step that few businesses are prepared to take. In any case, the collusion of the banks ultimately ensures that this ploy would *only* delay the abolition of financial privacy.

The only way actually to prevent, or roll back, this abomination will be to break completely the power of the government to dictate what we accept as money and end the government's control over the supply of money. As long as the Federal Reserve System remains intact with its current economic powers, we will all be perpetually under the threat of being turned into involuntary government credit customers. Only a complete end to the government's power over the economy can remove this threat. And, let's face it folks, the only thing that will accomplish that is the election of enough Libertarians to Federal office.

## Freedom ...

Cont. from pg. 2

to join the L.P. What I think many of us fail to realize or remember is that few of us emerged from our prior states as philosophically "pure" libertarians. Most of us had some learning and growing to do. Most of us still have some learning and growing to do. If we ever want to achieve any kind of status comparable with the older parties, we are going to have to broaden our base of support.

One sure way of *not* doing this is to limit our ranks to those we "elite" consider "pure" enough to join us. Maybe we can change our thinking to consider liberty as a continuum for political purposes. For example, there are many people who consider that some of what we say makes an awful lot of sense, in the area of taxation for example. But there is no way they can agree with our position, at least right now, on foreign policy. I think that what we have to do is package our "product"—Liberty—is easily saleable pieces. There is no

## Libertarian Calendar

1st Tuesday of every month, the Libertarian forum meets in the Brand Building, 203 S. Galena St., Aspen. Call 925-8292 for more information.

3rd Tuesday of every month, Boulder County Libertarian Association, 7:30 p.m., meets at 1913 Broadway, Boulder. Call Jerry van Sickle for details at (h) 442-0514 or (w) 443-5578.

2nd Wednesday of every month, CLP Cocktail Party, 7:30 p.m., 1456 Fillmore, Denver. Relaxed, informal, cash bar.

4th Thursday of every month, Park County Libertarians meet. Call Phil Prosser for details at 838-7693.

### NOVEMBER

14th — Cocktail Party at 1456 Fillmore, Denver, 7:30 p.m.

20th — Board of Directors meet at 1456 Fillmore, Denver, 7:30 p.m.

### DECEMBER

12th — Christmas Cocktail Party at 1456 Fillmore, Denver, 7:30 p.m.

19th — Board of Directors meet at 1456 Fillmore, Denver, 7:30 p.m.

Dec. 15th through Jan. 2nd — office closed for Christmas and New Years' Holidays.

### JANUARY

9th — Cocktail Party at 1456 Fillmore, Denver, 7:30 p.m.

16th — Board of Directors meet at 1456 Fillmore, Denver, 7:30 p.m.

Give yourself a year-long Christmas

foreign policy. I think that what we have to do is package our "product"—Liberty—is easily saleable pieces. There is no reason why such a person should not vote for a Libertarian Candidate as the only candidate with a reasonable approach to eliminating most or all of taxation without making him think that he also must agree with our position on defense before voting Libertarian.

Politics versus Philosophy. When we're dealing with an ideologically pure Party, it's an ongoing concern. We need both the activists and the philosophers in our movement. But it seldom works to have one doing the other's job.

If we really believe in a free market, then we know that we'll get the supporters we'll need because our product, LIBERTY, is so much better than what anybody else is selling.

There are opportunities for everyone who believes in a free society. There are organizations to handle everyone's kind of philosophical expression. There are segments of the Libertarian movement to enable everyone to participate.

What we all need to do is to keep our sights on that great mountain of FREEDOM and to choose the path we want to take, and to remember that *all* of us benefit when *one* of us reaches the top. The goal is not to be the first or to be the only, but to get there on whichever path is best for us as individuals. It is not a race to get there first, so that we should throw up roadblocks for others. This is not a race to win, but to finish, for then we can all be called winners.

This also means the confiscation—100% taxation—of cash savings, unless the saver goes to a government-regulated bank and gives up his or her savings for a pro-rated supply of the new non-private currency units. This means that individuals who simply do not realize what is going on, as well as those who try to resist having non-private money forced upon them, will be deprived of 100% of their assets by government fiat. Having previously told us that its worthless FRN's were "legal tender," the government is now preparing to go back on that promise, to say that after a certain date, they will no longer be accepted as "legal tender," just as it once refused to continue accepting previously-issued silver certificates for redemption in silver. A new arbitrary unit of account is now to

Commercial & Residential Electrical  
Service Work • Free Estimates  
Licensed & Insured

## BRYCE ELECTRIC, INC.

RICHARD 'BRYCE' CHEEK  
2009-C South Hannibal Street  
Aurora, Colorado 80013 (303) 751-7383

## DENSMORE DISCOVERIES

Your Connection To  
Caring, Professional People  
For Home or Business  
Since 1975



Dan Densmore

1-10pm Every Day 388-7438

## Give yourself a year-long Christmas gift: become a CLP member

Date \_\_\_\_\_ COLORADO and NATIONAL

I would like to: ☐ join ☐ renew my membership in the Libertarian Party as indicated:

Dues (per year): \$25 regular \$50 sustaining  
Includes National Membership unless you instruct us otherwise.  
Includes subscription to *Colorado Liberty* and the Libertarian Party NEWS

*"I hereby certify that I do not believe in or  
advocate the initiation of force as a means of  
achieving political or social goals."*

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ (required for National and State membership.)  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_ National and State Party memberships are  
STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_ separate. However, only National memberships are  
PHONE (H) \_\_\_\_\_ (B) \_\_\_\_\_ counted in determining each state's allotment of  
delegates at National Conventions.

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO:  
Colorado Libertarian Party

## IMAGINE FREEDOM: A Libertarian Introduction

Stormy Mon, editor  
(120 pgs., illustrated manuscript)  
Suggestions/Feedback/Criticism ...  
Sought/Welcomed/Appreciated

For a FREE copy:  
Libertarian Library  
2186 S. Holly, 207B  
Denver, CO 80222  
(303) 753-6789



John Mason, Michael Szymanski and Breck Swords as they "enjoy" the Reagan landslide.



We love you, too, Stormy. Welcome back.

## Book review

# 'A Liberty Primer' reads like much more than a primer

by Stormy Mon

*A LIBERTY PRIMER*

by Alan Burris

\$7.95 (SIL, Box 10224, Rochester, NY 14610)

This book is a great addition to libertarian literature and ranks with *Restoring the American Dream* by Robert Ringer and *For a New Liberty* by Murray Rothbard. It covers just about everything and is a resource that can be given to

someone who has been introduced to libertarian ideas but wants to know more.

The section on roads and highways is very good and will answer questions of even long-time activists that are unsure on this issue. The education chapter is extensive, but makes the curious argument that team sports indoctrinate people for statism. The Little League and many amateur adult soft ball teams will be interested in that.

Conservation is addressed, but is unnecessarily hostile and confrontational to

environmentalists. Alan succeeds in convincing the reader that more work and persuasiveness is needed on this subject. The discussion on limited government vs. no government is one of the best available: go that direction and see how far we can get.

A serious flaw is that the book is mislabeled: it's not a primer, even by the definition given at the front of the book. Alan is a Ph.D., and it is written at an intermediate level. Ed Clark's *A New Beginning* and World Research's *The Incredible Bread Machine* are primers. There are instances where Dr. Burris offers new arguments and suggested libertarian positions; this is not the function of a "primer."

The extensive quotations are a strength of the book. There are over 1000, with a handy index at the back. They fit into the text well, and many classics and favorites are here for future use and study. Colorado readers will be interested to know that several of the quotes and epigrams came from a booklet titled *Freedom Quotations*, originally published

in Aspen in 1980. One complaint: the quotations are in small type, which can be tiring.

For students and for discussion purposes, there is an extensive Study Guide and Recommended Reading in the back. Since the book is so inclusive of all libertarian topics, discussions could go on almost indefinitely, based on current events.

While thoroughly covering almost all non-government alternatives, Dr. Alan Burris expects the U.S. Government to protect his copyright. In the section on copyrights, he suggests there are common-law alternatives; BMI and ASCAP provide this for the music industry. Several libertarian writers from Ben Franklin and Tom Paine to Bob LeFevre and *Colorado Liberty* have had the confidence in their principles to successfully avoid the socialist protection of government copyrights. So for Dr. Burris and the Genesee SIL it's an instance of "do as we say, not as we do."

## Bergland speaks in Boulder ...

Cont. from pg. 1

into the Libertarian coalition, Bergland admonished, quoting the 19th-century Kansas journalist William Allen White: "Liberty is the only thing you cannot have unless you are willing to give it to others."

When asked how Libertarians differ on issues from the nation's Founding Fathers, Bergland replied, "The fundamental thinking is pretty similar."

The Declaration of Independence and

government the rights of eminent domain, commerce regulation, and taxation in several places, he said.

On international and foreign-policy issues, Bergland advocated unilateral disarming of just one nuclear warhead-carrying missile as a symbol of good faith to the Soviets.

"Invite the Soviet leadership to watch," he said. "It would encourage them to do the same."

ers, Bergland replied, "The fundamental thinking is pretty similar."

The Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights are very libertarian documents in places, but Libertarians differ with the original Constitution, which allowed slavery and granted the federal

## National vote ...

Cont. from pg. 1

In Alaska, Andre Marrou was elected to the State Legislature, and in Calaveras County, California (home of the celebrated frog-jumping contest), a second recount shows Libertarian Tom Tryon ahead by *one vote* in race race for County Supervisor. A third recount is expected.

### SERIOUS QUESTIONS

The weak showings by Libertarian candidates for higher office this election raises serious questions about participating in electoral contests as a means of advancing toward a free society.

Should we continue to run candidates for major offices... or would we do better to concentrate on lower-level contests, especially non-partisan races? Should we focus our energies on issue-oriented ballot initiatives, rather than on running candidates? Or should we abandon political action completely, and concentrate on educational efforts?

These questions, and others like them, are sure to be debated hotly between now and next year's national convention in Phoenix. Make sure your views are heard!

# CAMBERLEY CORP.

Buyer, Seller and Lender of  
Obscure Libertarian Titles.  
(303) 623-2551

"Invite the Soviet leadership to watch," he said. "It would encourage them to do the same."

Bergland summed up Libertarian foreign policy in three short phrases:

"Neutrality, free trade, and nuclear arms reduction."

Currently, there is great risk the U.S. will be "dragged into some international conflict" because bipartisan policies over the last two decades have greatly increased the risk of war.

"I want all of us to be free of the risk of war," Bergland said.

Using three criteria—foreign policy's effects on security, liberty, and the economy—Bergland said he would bring home the half-million troops currently stationed overseas, remove all federal barriers to trade and travel, negotiate seriously to reduce nuclear arms, remove all tactical nuclear weapons from Europe, and remove all land-based nuclear missiles from U.S. soil, leaving intact airborne and submarine-carried weapons systems. Missile silos only serve as targeting points for the Soviets, endangering the populations they are near, he said.

"We should declare a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons," Bergland said.

The Libertarian platform would bring economic stability and prosperity to the American economy and greater chances of peace to the world, he said.



School:  
9260 W. Jewell Ave.  
Lakewood, Colorado 80226  
985-1376 7429 S. Teller St.  
Littleton, Colorado 80123  
973-8578

Toddler • 3-6 • Elementary • Summer School

Montessori School Needs Space

The Montessori Child Discovery Center needs classroom space in South Lakewood. Approximately 4,000 sq. ft. are required. Contact Judy Huffman if you can help at 973-8578 or 985-1376.

epigrams came from a booklet titled *Freedom Quotations*, originally published

Dr. Burris and the Genesee SIL it's an instance of "do as we say, not as we do."

# THE WAIT IS OVER.

By now you've probably had it with official predictions and promises. "Hold on a little while longer," bureaucrats intone. "Prosperity is just around the corner." But how much longer can your business or your farm—or your *family*—wait?

Wait no longer. Everything the establishment didn't want you to know (and tried its best to keep from you) is found in an important new book entitled *A Declaration of Financial Independence* by John Grandbouche.

Grandbouche, a nationally known lecturer on constitutional law and taxation, writes in his compelling and highly-acclaimed book: "I have eliminated all financial problems from my life simply by changing the way I was doing things. I now enjoy more freedom from government interference and IRS abuse than I would have thought possible 10 years ago. You can too."

*A Declaration of Financial Independence*. It could be the most enlightening book you'll ever read.

"I have just read your book *A Declaration of Financial Independence* and have been shaken to my very core... Your writings have changed my life forever."

R.S.

Cherry Hill, NJ

JOHN  
GRANDBOUCHE



A  
DECLARATION  
OF  
FINANCIAL  
INDEPENDENCE

NCBA Publishing Division  
Dept. NE—7 PO Box 2255  
Longmont, Co. 80501

Please send me \_\_\_\_\_ copies of *A Declaration of Financial Independence* at \$7.95 each plus \$1.00 postage and handling (cash, check or money order). I understand that I may return it within 30 days for a full refund if I am not completely satisfied.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Please allow up to four weeks for delivery.